



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,251	02/06/2004	Eiichi Mori	042081	6493
38834	7590	05/04/2005		EXAMINER
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP				VU, PHU
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW				
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			2871	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/772,251	MORI, EIICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phu Vu	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1-8, and 11-14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Matsuo et. al US Patent No. 6762806.

Matsuo teaches a display device comprising: a display unit having a plate (fig. 1 element 4), a chassis (fig. 2 element 67) and a bezel (fig. 1, 2 element 6) holding peripheral edges of the plate, the bezel being provided with an extension portion (fig. 1 and 3 around element 66) which is extended from a side of the display unit and outwardly projects from an end of the chassis; and a cover (fig. 1 element 5) enclosing a back-side surface of the display unit.

Regarding claims 2, the reference teaches the bezel extension portion is disposed in a vicinity of a base portion of display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 3, the reference teaches the display unit arranged in a rectangular formation, and the bezel extension portion is extends from a lateral side of the display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 4, the reference teaches an inside space surrounded by end surfaces of the display unit (fig. 1 element 4) and the cover (fig. 1 element 1), and formed beneath a back-side of the surface of the bezel extension portion, and an electronic part (fig. 1 element 1) is disposed within the space.

Regarding claims 5-8, claim 5 is identical to claim 1 with the exception of the preamble, which recites “an electronic apparatus” instead of a display device. A display device is considered an electronic apparatus. Therefore claim 5 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1. Claim 6 follows the same relationship to claim 2 as does claim 7 to claim 3 and claim 8 to 4 claim.

Regarding claim 11, a the reference teaches display unit: having a plate (fig. 1 element 4), a chassis (fig. 2 element 67) and a bezel (fig. 1, 2 element 6) holding peripheral edges of the plate, the bezel being provided with an extension portion (fig. 1 and 3 around element 66) which is extended from a side of the display unit and outwardly projects from an end of the chassis.

Regarding claims 12, the reference teaches the bezel extension portion is disposed in a vicinity of a base portion of display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 13, the reference teaches the display unit arranged in a rectangular formation, and the bezel extension portion is extends from a lateral side of the display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 14, the reference teaches an inside space surrounded by end surfaces of the display unit (fig. 1 element 4) and the cover (fig. 1 element 1), and

formed beneath a back-side of the surface of the bezel extension portion, and an electronic part (fig. 1 element 1) is disposed within the space.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 and 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo as applied to claims 1 or 5, and in view of Fukuyama et. al US Patent 6741299. Matsuo teaches all the limitations of claims 9 and 10 except a display device that has height equivalent to the total height of the display unit and cover only.

Fukuyama teaches a display unit where the total height is equal to the total height of the display unit and cover only (see fig. 2 element 14) to reduce thickness (see column 1 lines 5-11). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a display wherein the only contributing elements to the total height are the display unit and cover to reduce overall thickness.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu Vu whose telephone number is (571)-272-1562. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571)-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu Vu
Examiner
AU 2871



ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800